

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This letter is responsive to the Office Action mailed on January 14, 2005. Accordingly, the response is considered as being timely filed.

By this response, the Applicant has amended claims 21 and 34 and has cancelled claim 30 without prejudice.

With regards to the claims, the Applicant has amended claim 21 to remove the term "optionally" and to include the subject matter of claim 30 which the Examiner indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Applicant has amended claim 34 to replace the term "single input signal" with the term "input signal" in line 2 of element (d) to correct an inadvertent error.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 112

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21-24 and 28-30, stating that the term "optionally" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the term are part of the claimed invention.

In response, the Applicant has removed the term "optionally" from claim 21.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 34 for not providing a sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the single input signal" in line 12.


In response, the Applicant has replaced the limitation "the single input signal" with the limitation "the input signal".

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any further concerns regarding the language of the claims or the applicability of the prior art, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at 416-957-1603.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT BRENNAN

By 
Tony R. Orsi, Registration No. 55,831
Bereskin & Parr, Customer No. 001059